

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

|                                  |   |                                     |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b> | ) |                                     |
|                                  | ) |                                     |
| v.                               | ) | <b>Case No. 2:15-cr-00069-JDL-2</b> |
|                                  | ) |                                     |
| <b>VICTOR LARA, JR.,</b>         | ) |                                     |
|                                  | ) |                                     |
| <b>Defendant.</b>                | ) |                                     |

**ORDER**

Defendant Victor Lara, Jr. is currently joined with codefendants Kourtney Williams and Ishmael Douglas. *See* ECF No. 25 at 1. On June 16, I entered a Speedy Trial Order which granted Douglas' request for an extension of the pre-trial motions deadline, and excluded the corresponding three-week period (from June 11, 2015 until July 2, 2015) from the Speedy Trial Clock. ECF No. 86 at 2. I found that the ends of justice served by that continuance outweighed the interests of Douglas and the public in a speedy trial, and also found that the continuance was reasonable as to all parties. *Id.*

Lara has objected to that Speedy Trial Order, citing his continued pre-trial detention. ECF No. 90 at 1. When a defendant objects to a Speedy Trial Act exclusion that results from a codefendant's continuance, I consider whether the resulting delay is reasonable for the objecting defendant. *See United States v. Maryea*, 704 F.3d 55, 66 (1st Cir. 2013). Here, the period of time to which Lara objects had already been excluded from Lara's Speedy Trial Clock as a consequence of his codefendant's request to place the case on the July 6, 2015 trial list. *See* ECF No. 78 at 4 (excluding May 6, 2015 through July 6, 2015). Accordingly, the Speedy Trial Order to which

Lara presently objects (ECF No. 86) has worked no additional delay in his case. In light of this, and having carefully reconsidered the totality of the relevant circumstances, I reaffirm that the delay due to Douglas' request is reasonable as to Lara.

Defendant's objection (ECF No. 90) is hereby **OVERRULED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: July 2, 2015

/s/Jon D. Levy  
U.S. District Judge